REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, 9, 11-20, 24-26, 28-37, 41, 43 and 45-54 are pending. Claims 36 and 49-53 have been amended to address typographical errors, and not for a reason related to patentability. Therefore, the present amendment has no further limiting effect on the scope of the claims. The present amendment also does not add any new matter to the above captioned application.

The Examiner requires restriction of the invention, under 35 U.S.C. § 121, to one of the following inventions:

Group I: Claims 2, 7, 9, 11-14, 20, 24-26, 28-31, 37, 41, 43, 45-48 and 54, drawn to representing and building a data structure, classified in class 707, subclass 102; and

Group II: Claims 15-19, 32-36 and 49-53, drawn to converting an expression form of a data structure, classified in class 707, subclass 101.

The Examiner contends that the inventions are distinct from each other and related as "related processes." The Examiner contends that the inventions are distinct because the inventions, as claimed, perform a different process, i.e., in one invention data structures are represented and built, and in the other data structure is manipulated. The Examiner further argues that the inventions, as claimed, do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

The Examiner further contends that restriction is proper because without the restriction there would be a serious search and examination burden placed on the Examiner because (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, (c) the inventions would require different fields of search, (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another

invention, and (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112.

Applicant elects the invention of Group II, claims 15-19, 32-36 and 49-53, for further prosecution of the merits. Applicant makes the election without traverse, and reserves the right to file a divisional application in order to pursue patent protection for the non-elected invention.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is in good condition for examination. Questions are welcomed by the below-signed attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

GRIFFIN & SZIPL, P.C.

for Reg #47,395

Joerg-Uwe Szipl
Registration No. 31,799

GRIFFIN & SZIPL, P.C.
Suite PH-1
2300 Ninth Street, South
Arlington, VA 22204

Telephone: (703) 979-5700
Facsimile: (703) 979-7429
Email: gands@szipl.com
Customer No.: 24203